Noname manuscript No.
(will be inserted by the editor)

Augmented lagrangian two-stage algorithm for LP and SCQP

Guoqiang Wang · Bo Yu · Zixuan Chen

arXiv:1703.05010v1 [math.OC] 15 Mar 2017

Received: date / Accepted: date

Abstract In this paper, we consider a framework of projected gradient iterations for linear programming (LP) and an augmented lagrangian two-stage algorithm for strongly convex quadratic programming (SCQP). Based on the framework of projected gradient, LP problem is transformed to a finite number of SCQP problems. Furthermore, we give an estimate of the number of the SCQP problems. We use augmented lagrangian method (ALM) to solve SCQP and each augmented lagrangian subproblem is solved by a two-stage algorithm exactly, which ensures the superlinear convergence of ALM for SCQP. The two-stage algorithm consists of the accelerated proximal gradient algorithm as the first stage algorithm which provides an approximate solution, and a simplified parametric active-set method as the second stage algorithm which gives an exact solution. Moreover, we improve the parametric active-set method by introducing a sorting technique to update the cholesky factorization. Finally, the numerical experiments on randomly generated and real-world test problems indicate that our algorithm is effective, especially for random problems.

Keywords linear programming · strongly convex quadratic programming · augmented lagrangian method · proximal gradient method · parametric active-set method

Guoqiang Wang
School of Mathematical Sciences, Dalian University of Technology, Dalian, Liaoning 116024, P. R. China
E-mail: wangguojim@mail.dlut.edu.cn

Bo Yu(✉)
School of Mathematical Sciences, Dalian University of Technology, Dalian, Liaoning 116024, P. R. China
E-mail: yubo@dlut.edu.cn

Zixuan Chen
School of Mathematical Sciences, Dalian University of Technology, Dalian, Liaoning 116024, P. R. China
E-mail: chenzixuan@mail.dlut.edu.cn

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010) 90C05 · 90C20

1 Introduction

In this paper, we consider the standard linear programming (LP) problem

$$\begin{array}{ll} \min & c^T x \\ \text{s.t.} & Ax = b, \\ & x \geq 0 \end{array} \tag{1}$$

and strongly convex quadratic programming (SCQP) problem

$$\begin{array}{ll} \min & \frac{1}{2} x^T Q x + r^T x \\ \text{s.t.} & Ax = b, \\ & x \geq 0, \end{array} \tag{2}$$

where Q is an $n \times n$ symmetric positive definite matrix, A is an $m \times n$ matrix, c is an n-dimensional vector and b is an m-dimensional vector.

A basic algorithm for LP problem is the simplex method [11, 12, 31] which was first proposed by Dantzig. The efficiency of simplex algorithm highly depends on the choice of the pivot rule which is used to select an entering index in each iteration. Due to this, a large number of pivot rules have been proposed, e.g., the steepest-edge pivoting strategy [18, 22] and its approximation Devex rule [25], which are commonly used in commercial packages, such as CPLEX [1, 7]. Recently, the so-called "largest-distance" rule [45] and "nested pricing" rule [44] were proposed by Pan, and the computational results against the Devex rule is very encouraging.

Another popular approach for LP is the interior-point method (IPM) which was first presented by Karmarkar [27]. Interior-point method is known as feasible IPM and infeasible IPM (IIPM). Feasible IPM starts with a strictly feasible interior point and maintain feasibility during the solution process. Instead of finding an initial feasible interior point. One method uses a self-dual embedding model to find an initial feasible interior point, by introducing artificial variables. Such technique was first presented by Ye et al. [58], and developed by Andersen and Ye, etc. in [2, 56]. IIPM which was first proposed by Lustig [34] and Tanabe [52] starts with an arbitrary positive point and feasibility is reached as optimality is approached. Global convergence of IIPM was obtained by Kojima [30]. Zhang [15] proved that, with proper initialization, an IIPM has $O(n^2 log\frac{1}{\varepsilon})$-iteration complexity. The performance of existing IIPM heavily depends on the choice of the starting point. We refer to [19, 28, 33, 37, 38, 47, 51, 59] for more information about IIPM.

Simplex method and interior-point methods have also been used for quadratic programming (QP) problem, see [46, 50, 53, 55].

Active-set method is also a famous method for LP [24] and QP [16, 17, 23]. Typical active-set algorithm solves a sequence of equality constrained subproblems and updates the active set by dropping or adding only one constraint

along the descent direction at each iteration. Hence, the efficiency of active-set depends on the initial point, that is, if the initial point is faraway from the solution, it needs many steps. Due to this reason, active-set method does not scale on the large scale problems.

Parametric active-set (PAS) method [15] solves a general convex quadratic programming

$$\min \ \{r^T x + \tfrac{1}{2} x^T Q x |\ l \leq Ax\}, \tag{3}$$

by solving a parametric quadratic programming (PQP) problem between a QP problem ($t = 1$) with known solution and the QP which needs to be solved ($t = 0, g(0) = r, l(0) = 0$),

$$\min \ \{g(t)^T x + \tfrac{1}{2} x^T Q x |\ b(t) \leq Ax\}, \tag{4}$$

This method was proposed by Ritter [49] and Best [6], and has been implemented in qpOASES [15]. Based on the property of the solution path, piecewise linear. PAS method is essentially a homotopy method which tracks the solution path from $t = 1$ to $t = 0$. At every step of PAS, it needs to solve linear systems:

$$\begin{bmatrix} Q & A'_{\mathcal{A}} \\ A_{\mathcal{A}} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x(t) \\ \lambda_{\mathcal{A}}(t) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -g(t) \\ b_{\mathcal{A}}(t) \end{bmatrix}, \tag{5}$$

which derives from the KKT conditions, where $\lambda(t)$ denotes the multipliers. If the start solution has almost the same optimal active set as the target solution, this algorithm would be very efficient. Whereas, PAS suffers from the same disadvantages as the active-set method that it needs many steps if the start active set is faraway from that of the end solution.

In addition to these these classical methods, augmented lagrangian method (ALM) was used to solve optimization with general constraints and simple bounds by Conn, etc [9] and QP by Dostal, etc [13]. Both of them solve the augmented lagrangian subproblems inexactly. However, the inexactly solving may destroy the superlinear convergence of ALM when it is applied for SCQP.

Instead of solving LP problem itself, Mangasarian [35,36] transformed linear programming to a weakly strictly-convex quadratic program

$$\begin{array}{ll} \min & c^T x + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} x^T x \\ \text{s.t.} & Ax = b, \\ & x \geq 0 \end{array} \tag{6}$$

by adding a small regularization term to the objective. Moreover, Mangasarian proved that (6) obtains a solution of (1) if ε is smaller than some $\bar{\varepsilon} > 0$. However, it is hard to derive a realistic priori estimate of $\bar{\varepsilon}$, and for some practical problems, $\bar{\varepsilon}$ would be very small. A small $\bar{\varepsilon}$ would reduce the efficiency of the SOR iterations which was employed to solve the dual problem.

In this paper, we implement projected gradient (PG) algorithm for LP problem (1) and augmented lagrangian two-stage algorithm for SCQP problem (2). First, based on the framework of projected gradient, LP problem is transformed to finite number of SCQP problems as follows:



Fig. 1 Projected gradient iterations for LP

Given an initial x^0. $\{x^\sigma\}$, $\sigma = 1, 2, ...$ are obtained by the following iterations

$$x^{\sigma+1} = P_\Omega(x^\sigma - \alpha c), \tag{7}$$

where $P_\Omega(\cdot)$ is the projection operator onto the feasible set

$$\Omega = \{x | Ax = b, x \geq 0\},$$

$\alpha > 0$ is an arbitrary real number. Obviously, (7) is a SCQP problem with $Q = I$ and $r = -\alpha c$. It is easy to see that Mangasarian's regularized linear programming (6) is a special case of (7), that is, $x^0 = 0$ and $\alpha = \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$. So we have $\bar{\alpha} = \frac{1}{\bar{\varepsilon}}$ such that if $x^0 = 0$ and $\alpha \geq \bar{\alpha}$, then x^1 is one solution of (1), that is, (7) converges in one step. However, similar to above, it is hard to derive a realistic priori estimate of $\bar{\alpha}$, and for some practical problems, $\bar{\alpha}$ would be very large, which maybe unfavourable for us to design efficient algorithms. In this paper, we overcome this problem and prove that for any $\alpha > 0$, PG iterations (7) converge in finite steps. Moreover, we go further by giving a lower bound of $c^T x^\sigma - c^T x^{\sigma+1}$ and an estimate of the maximum iterations of (7) for any given α.

Secondly, we follow Conn, etc [9] and Dostal, etc [13] by using ALM to solve SCQP problems (2) and (7). Instead of solving the augmented lagrangian subproblems inexactly in [9, 13], we solve the subproblems exactly in this paper, thus, the superlinear convergence of ALM for SCQP is ensured. Inspired by the features of PAS method, high-precision and effective if a good optimal active-set is give, we present a two-stage algorithm for the augmented lagrangian subproblems. In the first stage, we use Nesterov's accelerated proximal gradient algorithm (APG) method [41, 42] to approximately solve the augmented lagrangian subproblems. It is well known that APG is a first order algorithm, which takes small computational cost at every step and converges in a rate

$O(\frac{1}{k^2})$. Due to this, APG is effective for an approximate solution, which provides a good estimation of the optimal active-set. However, APG algorithm is slow at the end of the iterations, which hinders it to be an independent algorithm for (13) when high-precision solutions are required. We terminate the APG algorithm when some given criterions are satisfied and obtain an approximate solution. In the second stage, we generate a special parametric quadratic programming (PQP) problem

$$\min \ \{(p+tw)^T x + \tfrac{1}{2} x^T H x | x \geq 0\}. \tag{8}$$

between an initial QP problem whose solution is known and the augmented lagrangian subproblem which we want to solve. In the second stage, we implement a simplified PAS method which does not iterate the multipliers to track the solution path of (8). Benefiting from the approximately solving of APG, the steps of PAS would greatly reduce. Another work of this paper is that we improve the PAS method by presenting a sorting technique to speedily update the cholesky factorization. Benefiting from this sorting technique, every step takes small computational cost.

At last, we implement our algorithms to solve LPs and SCQPs from both synthetic data and real-world test sets.

The outline of the rest of this paper is as follows. In section 2, we prove that for any $\alpha > 0$, PG iterations converge in finite times. Moreover, an estimate of the maximum iterations is given. In section 3, we solve SCQP problem based on the framework of ALM. A two-stage algorithm for the augmented lagrangian subproblem is proposed in section 4. Finally, the numerical results are presented in section 5.

2 Projected gradient (PG) method for LP

Through this paper, we assume (1) has at least one finite solution.

Let X^* denote the solution set of (1). Define

$$\mathcal{M}_* = \{s | s \in x^* + N_\Omega(x^*) | x^* \in X^*\},$$

then we have the following theorem.

Theorem 1 *Assume LP problem (1) has at least one finite solution, then* $-c \in \text{int}\, \mathcal{M}_*^\infty$, *where* $\mathcal{M}_*^\infty$ *is the asymptotic cone of* $\mathcal{M}_*$.

Proof. We know from the optimality conditions that

$$-c \in N_\Omega(x^*), \forall x^* \in X^*.$$

Then we have $x^* + t(-c) \in \mathcal{M}_*$, $\forall t \geq 0$, which implies

$$-c \in \mathcal{M}_*^\infty. \tag{9}$$

Define

$$\mathcal{T}(x^*, d) = \{t | x^* + td \in X^*\},$$

where $d \in R^n$ and satisfies $d^T c = 0$. Since X^* is a closed convex set, $\mathcal{T}(x^*, d)$ is a closed interval. Next, we prove

$$-c \in \text{ri } (\text{span}\{-c, d\} \cap \mathcal{M}_*^\infty) \tag{10}$$

in four situations:

If $\mathcal{T}(x^*, d) = (-\infty, +\infty)$, it is easy to see d, $-d \in \mathcal{M}_*^\infty$. So (10) is obvious by (9).

If $\mathcal{T}(x^*, d) = (-\infty, t_{\max}]$ and $t_{\max} < \infty$. Similar to above, $-d \in \mathcal{M}_*^\infty$. Moreover, there exists $u \in N_\Omega(x^* + t_{\max} d) \cap \text{span}\{-c, d\}$ satisfies $\langle u, -d\rangle < 0$, so (10) holds for $d^T c = 0$. In fact, if there exists no such u, we can find $t'_{\max} > t_{\max}$ such that $x^* + t'_{\max} d \in X^*$ for Ω is a convex polyhedron, which is a contradiction to the definition of $\mathcal{T}(x^*, d)$.

If $\mathcal{T}(x^*, d) = [t_{\min}, +\infty)$ and $t_{\min} > -\infty$. Let $\tilde{d} = -d$, then $\mathcal{T}(x^*, \tilde{d}) = (-\infty, -t_{\min}]$, so we have $-c \in \text{ri } (\text{span}\{-c, \tilde{d}\} \cap \mathcal{M}_*^\infty) = \text{ri } (\text{span}\{-c, d\} \cap \mathcal{M}_*^\infty)$ from the situation above.

If $\mathcal{T}(x^*, d) = [t_{\min}, t_{\max}]$ and $t_{\min} > -\infty$, $t_{\max} < \infty$. Similar to above, there exists $u_1 \in N_\Omega(x^* + t_{\min} d) \cap \text{span}\{-c, d\}$ and $u_2 \in N_\Omega(x^* + t_{\max} d) \cap \text{span}\{-c, d\}$ such that

$$\langle u_1, d\rangle < 0 \text{ and } \langle u_2, d\rangle > 0.$$

So (10) holds for $d^T c = 0$.

Since d is arbitrary in the space $\{s | s^T c = 0\}$, we have $-c \in \text{int}\, \mathcal{M}_*^\infty$ from (10).

Theorem 2 *For any $x^0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, sequence $\{x^\sigma\}$ are obtained by (7), then the following statements are true.*

(i) *There exists $\bar{\alpha}$ such that $\forall \alpha \geq \bar{\alpha}$, $\{x^\sigma\}$ satisfies $x^\sigma = x^1 \in X^*$, $\sigma = 2, 3, \ldots$.*

(ii) *There exists $0 < \theta_{\min} \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$ such that $\forall \alpha > 0$,*

$$c^T x^\sigma - c^T x^{\sigma+1} \geq \alpha(1 - cos\, \theta_{\min}) \|c\|^2,$$

if $x^{\sigma+1} \notin X^*$. Moreover, $\theta_{\min} = \arccos(\frac{\|P_{[\text{bd}\mathcal{M}_*^\infty]}(-c)\|}{\|c\|})$, where $\text{bd}\mathcal{M}_*^\infty$ denotes the boundary of $\mathcal{M}_*^\infty$.

(iii) *For any $\alpha > 0$, $p \in \{-1 \cup \mathcal{N}^+\}$, there exists $\Gamma = \left[\frac{c^T x^{p+1} - c^T x^*}{\alpha(1 - \cos\, \theta_{\min})\|c\|^2} + p + 2\right]_+$, such that*

$$x^\sigma = x^\Sigma \in X^*, \forall \sigma \geq \Gamma.$$

Proof. We prove each of the three claims in turn.

(i) Define $B(r) = \{x | \|x\| \leq r\}$. Since $-c \in \text{int } \mathcal{M}_*^\infty$, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$-c + B(\varepsilon) \subset \mathcal{M}_*^\infty.$$

Then for any $x \in \mathcal{M}_*$ and $\alpha > 0$, we arrive at

$$x + \alpha B(\varepsilon) - \alpha c = x + \alpha(-c + B(\varepsilon)) \subset \mathcal{M}_*.$$

Let $\bar{\alpha} = \frac{\|x^0 - x\|}{\varepsilon}$, hence

$$\begin{aligned} x^0 - \bar{\alpha}c &= x + x^0 - x - \bar{\alpha}c \\ &= x + \frac{\|x^0 - x\|}{\varepsilon} \cdot \frac{\varepsilon(x^0 - x)}{\|x^0 - x\|} - \bar{\alpha}c \\ &\subset x + \bar{\alpha}B(\varepsilon) - \bar{\alpha}c \\ &\subset \mathcal{M}_*, \end{aligned}$$

moreover, for any $\alpha \geq \bar{\alpha}$

$$\begin{aligned} x^0 - \alpha c &= x^0 - \bar{\alpha}c - (\bar{\alpha} - \alpha)c \\ &\subset -(\bar{\alpha} - \alpha)c + \mathcal{M}_* \\ &\subset \mathcal{M}_*. \end{aligned}$$

So we have $x^1 = P_\Omega(x^0 - \alpha c) \in X^*, \forall \alpha \geq \bar{\alpha}$ from the definition of $\mathcal{M}_*$. Moreover, we have $x^2 = x^1 \in X^*$ for $-c \in N_\Omega(x^1)$, which is similar to $x^\sigma,\ \sigma = 3, 4, ...$

(ii) Assume $\alpha > 0$ is given.

If $x^{\sigma+1} = x^\sigma - \alpha c$, then

$$c^T x^\sigma - c^T x^{\sigma+1} = \alpha \|c\|^2.$$

If $x^{\sigma+1} \neq x^\sigma - \alpha c$, then

$$< x^\sigma - x^{\sigma+1}, x^\sigma - \alpha c - x^{\sigma+1} > \geq \frac{\pi}{2}$$

holds by (7), where $< s_1, s_2 >$ denotes the angle between s_1 and s_2. Let θ denote the angle between $x^\sigma - \alpha c - x^{\sigma+1}$ and $-c$. Since $x^{\sigma+1} \notin X^*$, we obtain $x^\sigma - \alpha c - x^{\sigma+1} \notin \text{int}\mathcal{M}_*^\infty$ from the convexity of Ω. Thus we have $\theta \geq \theta_{\min} = \arccos(\frac{\|P_{[\text{bd}\mathcal{M}_*^\infty]}(-c)\|}{\|c\|})$ from $-c \in \text{int}\mathcal{M}_*^\infty$. So

$$\begin{aligned} c^T x^\sigma - c^T x^{\sigma+1} &= c^T x^\sigma - c^T P_{[x^\sigma, x^\sigma - \alpha c]}(x^{\sigma+1}) \\ &= c^T x^\sigma - c^T(x^\sigma - \alpha(1 - \cos\theta)c) \\ &\geq \alpha(1 - \cos\theta_{\min})\|c\|^2, \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where $[x^\sigma, x^\sigma - \alpha c]$ denotes a segment whose endpoints are x^σ and $x^\sigma - \alpha c$. Note that since $-c \in \text{int}\ \mathcal{M}_*^\infty$, we have $1 - \cos\theta_{\min} > 0$.

(iii) For any $\kappa \geq 1$, if $x^\sigma \notin X^*,\ \sigma = 1, 2, .., \kappa$, then we have from (11) that

$$\begin{aligned} c^T x^p - c^T x^* &\geq c^T x^p - c^T x^\kappa \\ &= c^T x^p - c^T x^{p+1} + \sum_{\sigma=p+1}^{\kappa-1} (c^T x^\sigma - c^T x^{\sigma+1}) \\ &\geq c^T x^p - c^T x^{p+1} + (\kappa - p - 1)\alpha(1 - \cos\theta_{\min})\|c\|^2, \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

which implies

$$\kappa \leq \frac{c^T x^{p+1} - c^T x^*}{\alpha(1-\cos\theta_{\min})\|c\|^2} + p + 1.$$

Then we have (iii) when

$$\Gamma = \left[\frac{c^T x^{p+1} - c^T x^*}{\alpha(1-\cos\theta_{\min})\|c\|^2} + p + 2\right]_+ .$$

In practice, α may not be a constant, we use α^σ to denote it. From (12), we have

$$c^T x^{p+1} - c^T x^* \geq \sum_{\sigma=p+1}^{\kappa-1} \alpha^\sigma (1-\cos\theta_{\min})\|c\|^2$$

if $x^\kappa \notin X^*$, which implies

$$\sum_{\sigma=p+1}^{\kappa-1} \alpha^\sigma \leq \frac{c^T x^{p+1} - c^T x^*}{(1-\cos\theta_{\min})\|c\|^2}.$$

Then we know $x^\kappa \in X^*$ so long as

$$\sum_{\sigma=p+1}^{\kappa-1} \alpha^\sigma \geq \frac{c^T x^{p+1} - c^T x^*}{(1-\cos\theta_{\min})\|c\|^2}.$$

By Theorem 2, we conclude that if LP problem (1) has one finite solution, it can be transformed to a finite number of SCQP problems with projection form like (7).

3 ALM for SCQP

ALM was proposed by Hestenes [26] and Powell [48], partly as a reaction to the unfortunate side-effects associated with ill-conditioning of the simpler differentiable penalty and barrier functions. A survey in this area is Bertsekas [5]. Conn, etc [9] implemented ALM for general optimization with equality constraints and simple bounds, and Dostal, etc [13] used it to solve QP problem. Both of them solved the augmented lagrangian subproblem inexactly, which may destroy the superlinear convergence rate of ALM when it is used to solve SCQP. Another related work is Friedlander and Leyffer's two-phase algorithm [21] for general QP problem. In the first phase, Friedlander used gradient projection algorithm approximately minimizing the augmented lagrangian subproblem to obtain an estimate of the optimal active set of the QP. With that active-set estimate, the second phase solved an equality-constrained QP.

We follow Conn, etc and Dostal, etc by using ALM to solve SCQP problem, but we solve the subproblem exactly by a two-stage algorithm presented in Section 4. Thus the superlinear convergence of ALM is ensured.

The augmented lagrangian function of (2) is

$$\mathcal{L}_\beta(x,\lambda) = \frac{1}{2}x^TQx + r^Tx - \lambda^T(Ax-b) + \frac{\beta}{2}\|Ax-b\|^2,$$

where the quadratic term is the penalty for the linear constraints $Ax = b$. The k-th iteration of ALM for (2) begins with a given λ^k, and obtains $w^{k+1} = (x^{k+1},\ \lambda^{k+1})$ via

$$\begin{aligned} x^{k+1} &= \arg\min\ \{\mathcal{L}_\beta(x,\lambda^k) \mid x \geq 0\}, \\ \lambda^{k+1} &= \lambda^k - \beta(Ax^{k+1} - b). \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Problem (13) is a SCQP problem with only nonnegative constraints, which takes most of the computations in ALM. Many algorithms can be used for such problem, see e.g., gradient projection (GP) methods [3,8,10,39], Newton projection method [4], projected quasi-Newton [29], conjugate-gradient-type algorithms [14, 20, 40, 43, 57], SOR iterations [32, 54], APG [41, 42], etc. One of the main work in this paper is to present a two-stage algorithm to exactly solve subproblem (13) in the following section.

4 A two-stage algorithm for the first subproblem of ALM

In this section, we present a two-stage algorithm to solve (13) exactly. As described in the introduction, PAS method is efficient if a good estimation of the optimal active set is given. Moreover, APG is effective for to estimate the optimal active-set. For this reason, we use a first order algorithm to approximately solving (13) before PAS method. Benefiting from the approximate solving by APG, the steps of PAS is small.

Since the PQP problem in this paper has only nonnegative constraints, the KKT systems is simple, that is, we do not need to iterate the multipliers as the original PAS. Thus, we simplify the PAS method for our PQP problem in this section. Another work in this section is that we improve the PAS method by introducing a sorting technique to update the cholesky factorization, which takes smaller computations than that in qpOASES.

For convenience, we write (13) in a uniform form

$$\begin{aligned} \min\ & \tfrac{1}{2}z^THz + f^Tz \\ \text{s. t.}\ & z \geq 0, \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

where $H = Q + \beta A^TA$ is symmetric positive definite, $f = r - A^T\lambda^k - \beta A^Tb$.

It is easy to see that $\bar{z} \geq 0$ is the solution of (14) if and only if

$$H_j^T\bar{z} + f_j = 0,\ j \in J, \tag{15}$$

$$H_j^T\bar{z} + f_j \geq 0,\ j \in J_c, \tag{16}$$

where H_j denotes the j-th column of H, f_j denotes the j-th element of f and $J = \{j|\bar{z}_j > 0\}$, $J_c = \{j|\bar{z}_j = 0\}$ are indices sets. Moreover, J is called work-set and J_c is called active-set. Since H is positive definite, (15) and (16) are necessary and sufficient conditions.

We implement Nesterov's accelerated scheme to predict the solution of (14), which is the first stage of the two-stage algorithm.

Let $z^1 = y^0$ is given, $l = 1$, $\vartheta_1 = 1$, then

$$y^l = \arg\min_{z\geq 0} \langle Hz^l + f, z\rangle + \frac{L}{2}\|z - z^l\|^2, \tag{17}$$

$$\theta_{l+1} = \frac{1 + \sqrt{1 + 4\theta_l^2}}{2}, \tag{18}$$

$$z^{l+1} = y^l + (\frac{\theta_l - 1}{\theta_{l+1}})(y^l - y^{l-1}), \tag{19}$$

where $L \geq \|H\|$. At each iteration, (17) can be solved by a truncation operator

$$y^l = T(z^l - \tfrac{1}{L}(Hz^l + f)) = [z^l - \tfrac{1}{L}(Hz^l + f)]_+.$$

Hence, the main computation in each iteration is a matrix-vector multiplication.

We terminate APG algorithm when y^l satisfies one of the following criterions.

$$\mu_{\varepsilon_1}(y^l) = \mu_{\varepsilon_1}(y^{l-i}),\ \ for\ i = 1, .., S_{\max}, \tag{20}$$

$$\frac{\|y^l - y^{l-1}\|}{\|y^l\|} < \varepsilon_2, \tag{21}$$

where $\mu_{\varepsilon_1}(y) = \|[y - \|y\|\varepsilon_1]_+\|_0$, $S_{\max}$, ε_1 and ε_2 are some parameters which are given. Then we obtain

$$\hat{z} = \begin{cases} y_j^l, & y_j^l \geq \eta\|y^l\| \\ 0, & else \end{cases} \tag{22}$$

by filtration with $\eta > 0$. Let

$$w = \begin{cases} -H_j^T\hat{z} - f_j, & \hat{z}_j > 0, \\ \xi, & \hat{z}_j = 0, \end{cases}$$

where $\xi = -\min_j\{H_j^T\hat{z} + f_j|\hat{z}_j = 0\} + \delta$ and $\delta > 0$. So $\hat{z}$ is the solution of

$$\begin{array}{ll} \min & \frac{1}{2}z^T Hz + (f + w)^T z \\ \text{s. t.} & z \geq 0. \end{array} \tag{23}$$

A linear homotopy between the objective function of (14) and (23) is

$$h(t, z) = \tfrac{1}{2}z^T Hz + (f + tw)^T z\ ,\ t \in [0, 1].$$

Then we obtain the solution of (14) by solving the PQP problem

$$\begin{array}{ll} \min & h(t,z) = \frac{1}{2} z^T H z + (f + tw)^T z \\ \text{s. t.} & z \geq 0 \end{array} \tag{24}$$

In the second stage, we use PAS method to track the solution path of (24) from $t = 1$ to $t = 0$. Since (24) has only nonnegative constraints, we do not need to iterate the multipliers. Thus we simplify the parametric active-set to solve (24) as follows. Simultaneously, we present the sorting technique and show why it can speedily update the cholesky factorization.

Let $z(t)$, $t \in [0,1]$ be a vector-function of t denoting the solution path of (24). Suppose $z(t)$ has M piece-wise intervals and set $t_0 = 1, t_M = 0$. Let (t_i, t_{i-1}), $i = 1, ..., M$ denote the intervals, in which $z(t)$ is linear. Moreover, Let $J(z(t)) = \{j | z_j > 0\}$ denote the work set. Since $z(t)$ is piece-wise linear, $J(z(t))$ is the same in every interval. We use $J^i = \{J(z(t)) | t \in (t_i, t_{i-1})\}$ to denote the work set in the i-th interval and let $J_c^i = \{1, ..., n\} \backslash J^i$.

Before presenting the simplified PAS method, we make the following assumption.

Assumption 1 *There is no interval $(a, b) \subset [0, 1]$ such that there exists j satisfies*

$$z_j(t) = 0 \text{ and } \quad H_j^T z(t) + f_j + tw_j = 0, \forall t \in (a, b), \tag{25}$$

where $a < b$.

Then we have

Lemma 1 *If Assumption 1 holds, then for any $i \in \{1, ..., M\}$, there exists only one indices set $S^i \subset \{1, ..., n\}$ such that*

$$z_{S^i}(t) = -H_{S^i S^i}^{-1}(f_{S^i} + tw_{S^i}) > 0, \tag{26}$$

$$z_{S_c^i}(t) = 0, \tag{27}$$

$$H_{S_c^i}^T z(t) + f_{S_c^i} + tw_{S_c^i} > 0 \tag{28}$$

hold for any $t \in (t_i, t_{i-1})$, where $S_c^i = \{1, ..., n\} \backslash S^i$, $H_{S^i S^i}$ and $H_{S_c^i S^i}$ denote the sub-matrices of H with appropriate rows and columns.

Proof. It is obvious J^i satisfies (26)-(28) by the optimality conditions (15) and (16).

Now assume there exists another indices set $I^i \neq J^i$ satisfies (26)-(28). It is easy to see that $J^i \subset I^i$ by (27). Moreover, for any $j \in I^i \backslash J^i$, $z_j(t) = 0$ and $H_j^T z(t) + f_j + tw_j = 0$ by (26). This contradicts with Assumption 1.

Under Assumption 1, we start PAS algorithm with $z(t_0) = \hat{z}$, $J^1 = \{j | \hat{z}_j > 0\}$ and $J_c^1 = \{1, ..., n\} \backslash J^1$. By induction, we need to confirm t_i and J^{i+1} , $i = 1, 2, ...M$.

From the optimality conditions (15) and (16), $z(t)$ has closed form

$$\begin{aligned} z_{J^i}(t) &= -H_{J^i J^i}^{-1}(f_{J^i} + tw_{J^i}), \\ z_{J_c^i}(t) &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

in the i-th interval. According to this, continue to decrease t from t_{i-1} until one of the following events occurs.

(i) There exists $j \in J^i$ such that $z_j(t) = 0$.
(ii) There exists $j \in J_c^i$ such that $H_{jJ^i} z_{J^i}(t) + (f_j + tw_j) = 0$.

When (i) or (ii) happens, J^i and J_c^i need to exchange indices with each other.

According to (i) and (ii), we define

$$\hat{j} = \arg\max_j \{\frac{u_j^i}{v_j^i} < t_{i-1} | j \in J^i \ and \ v_j^i < 0\},$$

$$\tilde{j} = \arg\max_j \{\frac{\psi_j^i}{\phi_j^i} < t_{i-1} | j \in J_c^i \ and \ \phi_j^i < 0\},$$

where $u^i = -H_{J^iJ^i}^{-1} f_{J^i}$, $v^i = H_{J^iJ^i}^{-1} w_{J^i}$, $\psi^i = H_{J_c^iJ^i} u^i + f_{J_c^i}$ and $\phi^i = H_{J_c^iJ^i} v^i - w_{J_c^i}$.

If $\hat{j}$ is empty, set $\frac{u_{\hat{j}}^i}{v_{\hat{j}}^i} = -\infty$, which is the same to $\tilde{j}$. Then we discuss the update strategy of J^i in four cases.

Case 1: $\frac{u_{\hat{j}}^i}{v_{\hat{j}}^i} > \frac{\phi_{\tilde{j}}^i}{\psi_{\tilde{j}}^i}$ and $\frac{u_{\hat{j}}^i}{v_{\hat{j}}^i} > 0$.

It means (i) occurs first, then we obtain $t_i = \frac{u_{\hat{j}}^i}{v_{\hat{j}}^i}$, $J^{i+1} = J^i \backslash \hat{j}$ and $J_c^{i+1} = J_c^i \cup \hat{j}$. Let $\tilde{z}(t)$ have the following closed form

$$\tilde{z}_{J^{i+1}}(t) = -H_{J^{i+1}J^{i+1}}^{-1}(f_{J^{i+1}} + tw_{J^{i+1}}), \tag{29}$$

$$\tilde{z}_{J_c^{i+1}}(t) = 0 \tag{30}$$

in the $(i+1)$-th interval. According to Lemma 1, we need to validate $\tilde{z}(t)$ satisfies (26)-(28) in the $(i+1)$-th interval, that is, when $t_i - \tau < t < t_i$,

$$\tilde{z}_{J^{i+1}}(t) > 0, \tag{31}$$

$$H_{J_c^{i+1}} \tilde{z}(t) + f_{J_c^{i+1}} + tw_{J_c^{i+1}} > 0 \tag{32}$$

should hold, where $\tau > 0$ is small enough. (31) holds for $\tilde{z}_{J^{i+1}}(t)$ is continuous about t. Then we just need to validate (32), which can be finished by just validating $H_{\hat{j}}^T \tilde{z}(t) + f_{\hat{j}} + tw_{\hat{j}} > 0$, that is, $\phi_{\hat{j}}^{k,i+1} > 0$. If it holds, the update is correct, and $z(t) = \tilde{z}(t)$ in the $(i+1)$-th interval, otherwise, $\hat{j}$ should not be added to J^{i+1}, that is, $J^{i+1} = J^i$ and $J_c^{i+1} = J_c^i$.

Case 2: $\frac{u_{\hat{j}}^i}{v_{\hat{j}}^i} < \frac{\phi_{\tilde{j}}^i}{\psi_{\tilde{j}}^i}$ and $\frac{\phi_{\tilde{j}}^i}{\psi_{\tilde{j}}^i} > 0$.

It means (ii) occurs first, then $t_i = \frac{\phi_{\tilde{j}}^i}{\psi_{\tilde{j}}^i}$, $J^{i+1} = J^i \cup \tilde{j}$ and $J_c^{i+1} = J_c^i \backslash \tilde{j}$. The later analysis is similar to Case 1. We need to validate $\tilde{z}(t)$ with the form (29) and (30) satisfies (31), (32) in the $(i+1)$-th interval when J^{i+1} and J_c^{i+1} are updated as above, it can be finished by just validating $\tilde{z}_{\tilde{j}}(t) > 0$ when $t_i - \tau < t < t_i$, that is, $v_{\tilde{j}}^{i+1} > 0$. If this holds, the update is correct, and

$z(t) = \tilde{z}(t)$ in the $(i+1)$-th interval. Otherwise, $J^{i+1} = J^i$ and $J_c^{i+1} = J_c^i$ as above.

Case 3: $\frac{u_{\tilde{j}}^i}{v_{\tilde{j}}^i} = \frac{\phi_{\tilde{j}}^i}{\psi_{\tilde{j}}^i} > 0$.

It means (i) and (ii) occur at the same time, then $t_i = \frac{u_{\hat{j}}^i}{v_{\hat{j}}^i}$, $J^{i+1} = (J^i \backslash \hat{j}) \cup \tilde{j}$ and $J_c^{i+1} = (J_c^i \cup \hat{j}) \backslash \tilde{j}$. According to Case 1 and Case 2, the difference from Case 1 and Case 2 is that we need to validate both $H_{\hat{j}}^T \tilde{z}(t) + f_{\hat{j}} + t w_{\hat{j}} > 0$ and $\tilde{z}_{\tilde{j}}(t) > 0$ when $t_i - \tau < t < t_i$, that is, $\phi_{\hat{j}}^{i+1} > 0$ and $v_{\tilde{j}}^{i+1} > 0$. If both of them hold, the update is correct. Otherwise, if $\phi_{\hat{j}}^{i+1} < 0$, then $J^{i+1} = J^i \cup \tilde{j}$, $J_c^{i+1} = J_c^i \backslash \tilde{j}$, and if $v_{\tilde{j}}^{i+1} < 0$, then $J^{i+1} = J^i \backslash \hat{j}$, $J_c^{i+1} = J_c^i \cup \hat{j}$, moreover, if $\phi_{\hat{j}}^{i+1} < 0$ and $v_{\tilde{j}}^{i+1} < 0$ both, then $J^{i+1} = J^i$ and $J_c^{i+1} = J_c^i$.

Case 4: $\frac{u_{\hat{j}}^i}{v_{\hat{j}}^i} \le 0$, $\frac{\phi_{\tilde{j}}^i}{\psi_{\tilde{j}}^i} \le 0$.

In this case, the algorithm will terminate and we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} z_{J^i}(0) &= -H_{J^i J^i}^{-1} f_{J^i}, \\ z_{J_c^i}(0) &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

By tracking the solution path of (24) as above, we obtain $\bar{z} = z(0)$, which is the solution of (14).

It is easy to see that the complexity of the simplified PAS algorithm depends on the number of the update times between J^i and J_c^i. Specifically, at every step, we need to solve two symmetric positive definite linear systems of equations

$$H_{J^i J^i} u^i = f_{J^i} \quad and \quad H_{J^i J^i} v^i = w_{J^i} \tag{34}$$

and do one matrix-vector multiplication

$$[\psi^i, \phi^i] = H_{J_c^i J^i}[u^i, v^i] + [f_{J_c^i}, -w_{J_c^i}]. \tag{35}$$

In fact, we just need to solve one equation in (34) for

$$u^i + t_{i-1} v^i = x_{J^i}(t_{i-1}).$$

Since $H_{J^i J^i}$ is positive definite, we apply cholesky factorization method for (34). Moreover, since J^i changes few elements at every step, instead of decomposing $H_{J^i J^i}$ from scratch, we can efficiently update the cholesky factorization when few elements of J^i change by the following sorting technique.

Note that the index j_1 is more likely to be removed from J^i than j_2 if $\hat{z}_{j_1} < \hat{z}_{j_2}$. For this reason, at the start of PAS, we sort $J(\hat{z})$ by the value of $\hat{z}_j, j \in J(\hat{z})$, that is,

$$\hat{z}_{[J(\hat{z})]_s} \ge \hat{z}_{[J(\hat{z})]_{s+1}},$$

where $[J(\hat{z})]_s$ denotes the s-th element of $J(\hat{z})$. With this sorting technique, the indices corresponding to the smaller $\hat{z}_j$ would be sorted at the end of $J(\hat{z})$, thus the indices removed from J^i would be focused at the end of J^i. Moreover,

when an index is added to J^i, we put it at the end of J^i. Precisely, we update cholesky factorization as follows:

• **Update cholesky factorization.** Assume J^i is known and $H_{J^iJ^i}$ has cholesky factorization

$$R^TR = H_{J^iJ^i}.$$

▷ Add an index $\tilde{j}$ to J^i, then

$$H_{J^{i+1}J^{i+1}} = \begin{bmatrix} H_{J^iJ^i} & H_{J^i\tilde{j}} \\ H_{\tilde{j}J^i} & H_{\tilde{j}\tilde{j}} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let $H_{J^{i+1}J^{i+1}} = \tilde{R}^T\tilde{R}$ is the cholesky factorization, it is easy to see

$$\tilde{R} = \begin{bmatrix} R & \tilde{r} \\ 0 & \sqrt{H_{\tilde{j}\tilde{j}} - \tilde{r}^T\tilde{r}} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $R^T\tilde{r} = H_{J^i\tilde{j}}$. This update takes noly $\frac{1}{2}\Gamma_i^2$ flops, where $\Gamma_i = |J^i|$.

▷ Remove an index $\hat{j}$ from J^i, then

$$H_{J^{i+1}J^{i+1}} = \begin{bmatrix} H_{J_1^iJ_1^i} & H_{J_1^iJ_2^i} \\ H_{J_2^iJ_1^i} & H_{J_2^iJ_2^i} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $J^i = [J_1^i, \hat{j}, J_2^i]$. Assume $H_{J^{i+1}J^{i+1}} = \hat{R}^T\hat{R}$ is the cholesky factorization, then we have

$$\hat{R} = \begin{bmatrix} R_{I_1^iI_1^i} & R_{I_1^iI_2^i} \\ 0 & \bar{R} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $I_1^i = \{1, ..., |J_1^i|\}$, $I_2^i = \{|J_1^i| + 2, ..., |J^i|\}$ and $\bar{R}^T\bar{R} = H_{J_2^iJ_2^i} - R^T_{I_1^iI_2^i}R^i_{I_1^iI_2^i}$. So in this case, it will take $\frac{2}{3}|J_2^i|^3$ flops.

Precisely, it takes

$$\begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}\Gamma_i^2, & add; \\ \frac{2}{3}|J_2^i|^3 + (\Gamma_i - |J_2^i|)|J_2^i|^2, & remove; \end{cases} \tag{36}$$

flops to upadte the cholesky decomposition in each step of PAS method with sorting technique, where $(\Gamma_i - |J_2^i|)|J_2^i|^2$ is to the matrix-vector multiplications $R^T_{I_1^iI_2^i}R_{I_1^iI_2^i}$. The update techniques of the PAS method in qpOASES would take

$$\begin{cases} 5\Gamma_i^2, & add; \\ \frac{5}{2}\Gamma_i^2, & remove; \end{cases} \tag{37}$$

flops at each step. Our update technique will take smaller computations when adding an index than that in qpOASES. Benefiting from the sorting technique, $|J_2^i| \ll \Gamma_i$, then the removing update is cheap.

We present the framework of augmented lagrangian two-stage algorithm (for convenience, we use ALM/APG-PAS to denote it, where APG denotes the first stage algorithm and PAS denotes the second stage algorithm) for SCQP (2) as Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 ALM/APG-PAS algorithm for SCQP (with sorting technique)

Input:
x^0, λ^0, β, tol;
Output:
x^{k+1}, λ^{k+1};
while $\|x^k - x^{k+1} > tol$ **do**
Approximately solve (13) with APG algorithm like (17), (18) and (19) until (20) or (21) is satisfied.
Track the solution path of (24) from $t = 1$ to $t = 0$ and obtain x^{k+1} in a form like (33).
$\lambda^{k+1} = \lambda^k - \beta(Ax^{k+1} - b)$.
end while

Algorithm 2 projected gradient (PG) iterations for LP

Input:
x^0, α, $f_{tol} > 0$;
Output:
x^σ;
while $c^T x^\sigma - c^T x^{\sigma+1} > f_{tol}$ **do**
Solve SCQP problem (7) by Algorithm 1.
$\sigma = \sigma + 1$.
end while

The framework of PG for LP is presented as Algorithm 2.

Note that the termination criterion of Algorithm 2 derives from the item (ii) of Theorem 2. Moreover, In algorithm 2, the solution of the front SCQP problem can be set as the initial guess of the back one.

5 Numerical results

In this section, we present numerical results obtained from the implementation of our algorithms described above. The numerical experiments were performed on Matlab 8.1 programming platform (R2013a) running on a machine with Windows 7 operation system, Intel(R) Core(TM)i7 CPU 6700 3.40GHz processor and 32GB of memory. The LP-solvers and QP-solvers of Cplex 12.6 and Gurobi 6.5.0 are called by Matlab interfaces.

We obtain data from both synthetic test sets and real-world test sets.

- **Synthetic data:**

First, we randomly generated LPs (1) with Matlab codes as:

A=sprandn(m, n, d_A); b=10∗randn(m,1); c=rand(n,1),

where m,n are pre-determined, d denotes the density of A which is also pregiven.

Secondly, we randomly generated SCQPs (2) as:

A=sprandn(m, n, d_A); B=sprandn(q, n, d_B); Q=B′∗B+10^{-4}∗speye(n); r=−B′∗randn(m,1); b=10∗randn(m,1),

where d_A, d_B are pre-given. We use d_H to denote the density of H.

- **Real-world data:**

Table 1 Randomly generated LP and SCQP

Problem	m	q	n	d_A	d_B	d_H
LP-D1	400	-	1000	1	-	-
LP-D2	800	-	2000	1	-	-
LP-D3	1000	-	5000	1	-	-
LP-D4	300	-	8000	1	-	-
LP-D5	4000	-	10000	1	-	-
LP-S1	100	-	2000	0.01	-	-
LP-S2	1000	-	5000	0.01	-	-
LP-S3	800	-	8000	0.01	-	-
LP-S4	4000	-	10000	0.01	-	-
LP-S5	800	-	15000	0.01	-	-
LP-S6	8000	-	20000	0.001	-	-
LP-S7	15000	-	32000	0.001	-	-
SCQP-D1	100	100	1000	1	1	1
SCQP-D2	400	1000	1000	1	1	1
SCQP-D3	100	200	2000	1	1	1
SCQP-D4	800	200	2000	1	1	1
SCQP-D5	500	4500	5000	1	1	1
SCQP-D6	2000	4500	5000	1	1	1
SCQP-D7	800	10	8000	1	1	1
SCQP-D8	800	100	8000	1	1	1
SCQP-D9	4000	5000	10000	1	1	1
SCQP-D10	4000	9000	10000	1	1	1
SCQP-S1	10	10	5000	0.01	0.003	2.88E-4
SCQP-S2	10	100	5000	0.01	0.003	1.08E-3
SCQP-S3	10	1000	5000	0.01	0.003	9.13E-3
SCQP-S4	10	5000	5000	0.01	0.001	5.22E-3
SCQP-S5	100	1000	10000	0.01	0.001	1.10E-3
SCQP-S6	1000	1000	10000	0.01	0.001	1.09E-3
SCQP-S7	4000	10000	10000	0.01	0.001	1.10E-3
SCQP-S8	4000	10000	20000	0.001	0.0001	1.50E-4
SCQP-S9	8000	10000	20000	0.001	0.0001	1.49E-4
SCQP-S10	8000	10	30000	0.002	0.0002	3.34E-5
SCQP-S11	12000	1000	30000	0.001	0.0002	4.32E-4
SCQP-S12	12000	29999	30000	0.001	0.0001	3.33E-4

For Netlib[1] LP test set, we selected a subset of LPs which are feasible and have finite solution. For CUTEr[2] QP test set, we chose a subset of medium-scale QPs which was up to 20200 variables. The QPs were reformulated to the standard form (2) and we added a regularization $10^{-4}\|x\|^2$ to the objective if Q is semi-positive definite.

In our experiments, the parameter "MaxIter" of the solvers in Matlab was set to be $10n$ and "TolFun" to be 10^{-10}. The solvers of CPLEX and GUROBI used the default settings. For randomly generated LP problems, PG algorithm started from the original point. Since the solution of the problems in Netlib test set are faraway from the original point, it may cause the PG method to iterate many times before convergence. Due to this reason, we use the solver of Matlab ((interior-point method)) to obtain an initial point with a first-order optimality precision 10^{-2}. The running time of PG method in Table 4 and 5 have added the time of Matlab (interior-point method).

We first compared PG method with the LP-solvers of Cplex 12.6 (interior-point-method), Gurobi 6.5.0 (Simplex method) and Matlab 2013a (interior-point method and simplex method) on solving randomly generated LPs and LPs from Netlib test set.

Secondly, we compared ALM/APG-PAS method with the QP-solvers of Cplex 12.6 (interior-point method), Gurobi 6.5.0 (Simplex method) and Matlab 2013a (interior-point method) on solving randomly generated SCQPs and SCQPs from CUTEr test set. In this part, ALM/APG-PAS started from the original point for both random problems and CUTEr test set.

[1] http://users.clas.ufl.edu/hager/coap/Pages/matlabpage.html
[2] https://github.com/YimingYAN/QP-Test-Problems

The comparison of the above experiments includes running time, equality constraints violation and optimal values. The results are displayed in the Table 2-7. We use f_*, f_S to denote the optimal values obtained by our algorithms and the other corresponding softwares. Moreover, we use "M" to denote the running time which is more than 25000s.

Since the parameter α in (7) can not be too large, PG algorithm may need to solve many SCQPs if the initial point is not good. Due to this reason, PG performed not well as Cplex and Gurobi on the LPs of Netlib test set. But for randomly generated LPs, the original point is a good initial point, which means the PG algorithm only needs to iterate for several times. Due to this, PG outperforms Gurobi and Cplex on some randomly generated LPs.

The results show that ALM/APG-PAS is efficient for both randomly generated SCQPs and SCQPs from CUTEr test set. Especially for some randomly generated SCQPs, ALM/APG-PAS is better than the other solvers. Moreover, according to the results, we found ALM/APG-PAS is more suitable for solving dense problems and problems with many constraints

Table 2 Experiments on randomly generated LP

Problem	Results	PG	Cplex(IPM)	Gurobi(simplex)	Matlab(IPM)	Matlab(simplex)
LP-D1	Time	0.86	0.80	0.58	3.33	17.90
	$\|Ax-b\|$	7.8E-11	4.0E-12	4.8E-12	1.3E-09	6.3E-10
	f_*-f_S	-	-2.1E-11	-2.0E-11	-1.3E-10	-1.2E-11
LP-D2	Time	11.47	8.47	5.59	30.25	232.99
	$\|Ax-b\|$	2.4E-11	1.2E-11	1.3E-11	8.8E-13	3.8E-09
	f_*-f_S	-	-5.3E-12	-6.1E-12	-8.2E-12	1.0E-10
LP-D3	Time	27.33	33.11	16.58	110.67	918.04
	$\|Ax-b\|$	8.9E-10	1.2E-11	1.5E-11	9.9E-13	2.5E-09
	f_*-f_S	-	1.0E-12	1.1E-12	9.9E-13	-1.0E-11
LP-D4	Time	15.97	3.82	2.27	19.47	55.78
	$\|Ax-b\|$	5.7E-10	1.8E-12	1.6E-12	7.5E-11	3.8E-09
	f_*-f_S	-	-6.2E-13	-6.2E-12	-5.0E-12	6.1E-12
LP-D5	Time	401.56	1277.07	460.83	3472.62	M
	$\|Ax-b\|$	2.2E-10	2.3E-10	2.6E-10	4.0E-12	-
	f_*-f_S	-	-5.0E-12	-1.2E-11	-7.7E-12	-
LP-S1	Time	0.15	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.07
	$\|Ax-b\|$	2.1E-11	1.3E-13	9.7E-14	7.8E-13	4.9E-13
	f_*-f_S	-	-2.1E-14	-2.1E-14	-2.1E-14	-2.3E-14
LP-S2	Time	3.92	1.62	0.93	6.40	350.84
	$\|Ax-b\|$	1.0E-08	1.5E-10	4.5E-11	1.6E-08	2.7E-11
	f_*-f_S	-	-8.1E-10	-8.1E-10	-1.4E-09	-5.3E-09
LP-S3	Time	5.73	1.09	0.39	3.37	171.34
	$\|Ax-b\|$	8.0E-10	2.6E-10	6.8E-12	1.4E-10	2.7E-12
	f_*-f_S	-	-5.3E-09	-5.3E09	-5.4E-10	-5.3E-10
LP-S4	Time	63.80	96.59	59.78	458.33	M
	$\|Ax-b\|$	4.2E-10	3.8E-09	2.9E-10	6.2E-09	-
	f_*-f_S	-	-5.2E-10	-4.9E-10	1.5E-10	-
LP-S5	Time	5.94	0.48	0.40	4.33	225.65
	$\|Ax-b\|$	6.9E-11	6.2E-11	7.4E-12	4.2E-11	1.9E-10
	f_*-f_S	-	4.2E-12	1.7E-13	3.7E-13	-4.3E-13
LP-S6	Time	348.79	148.93	97.58	3007.46	M
	$\|Ax-b\|$	6.2E-09	2.7E-08	5.5E-09	1.4E-11	-
	f_*-f_S	-	-2.8E-08	-7.7E-09	-1.8E-09	-
LP-S7	Time	967.46	2024.15	1289.04	24726.41	M
	$\|Ax-b\|$	2.6E-09	2.1E-07	1.6E-08	1.6E-11	-
	f_*-f_S	-	-1.1E-06	-1.2E-06	-1.3E-06	-

Finally, in order to show our sorting technique is useful. we compared the improved PAS method with the original PAS method on solving the first augmented lagrangian problem (14) from $\hat{z}$. The results are displayed in Table 8.

Table 3 Experiments on randomly generated SCQP

Problem	Results	ALM/APG-PAS	Cplex(IPM)	Gurobi(simplex)	Matlab(IPM)
SCQP-D1	Time	1.14	3.83	1.31	1.83
	$\|Ax-b\|$	2.2E-10	4.0E-10	4.5E-10	1.4E-13
	f_*-f_S	-	-9.7E-08	-1.9E-06	-2.6E-09
SCQP-D2	Time	0.53	3.55	1.98	6.81
	$\|Ax-b\|$	5.0E-12	1.3E-07	1.9E-03	3.5E-13
	f_*-f_S	-	-8.8E-05	-1.6E-08	-1.9E-10
SCQP-D3	Time	10.57	11.94	8.96	7.25
	$\|Ax-b\|$	6.2E-09	8.0E-10	1.8E-10	1.6E-13
	f_*-f_S	-	5.7E-06	-1.4E-07	-2.3E-07
SCQP-D4	Time	37.43	268.51	197.54	343.63
	$\|Ax-b\|$	3.3E-11	6.5E-08	2.3E-08	6.8E-13
	f_*-f_S	-	-1.9E-05	-1.1E-08	-5.4E-10
SCQP-D5	Time	13.87	36.31	27.22	94.87
	$\|Ax-b\|$	7.3E-10	3.4E-08	4.7E-09	1.4E-12
	f_*-f_S	-	-1.6E-05	-4.9E-08	-7.3E-09
SCQP-D6	Time	37.87	564.12	415.97	1117.10
	$\|Ax-b\|$	2.8E-11	1.2E-06	2.4E-08	1.9E-12
	f_*-f_S	-	-5.9E-04	-1.5E-07	-1.9E-10
SCQP-D7	Time	354.49	2253.35	1824.25	992.83
	$\|Ax-b\|$	9.5E-09	1.8E-08	4.3E-08	1.8E-12
	f_*-f_S	-	7.2E-07	-8.3E-05	-9.4E-08
SCQP-D8	Time	298.17	1559.02	1156.48	505.67
	$\|Ax-b\|$	1.0E-08	6.4E-09	5.6E-09	1.0E-12
	f_*-f_S	-	-2.9E-08	-2.1E-04	-6.3E-07
SCQP-D9	Time	464.47	4824.61	4173.30	12284.23
	$\|Ax-b\|$	3.2E-11	3.7E-06	1.5E-07	1.7E-11
	f_*-f_S	-	-1.7E-06	-4.3E-06	-8.3E-11
SCQP-D10	Time	356.85	5176.75	3958.63	9367.10
	$\|Ax-b\|$	2.9E-11	1.1E-06	3.0E-08	4.2E-12
	f_*-f_S	-	-8.2E-04	-1.3E-07	-1.9E-07
SCQP-S1	Time	0.15	0.03	0.02	0.09
	$\|Ax-b\|$	9.7E-11	1..3E-07	7.4E-15	5.7E-15
	f_*-f_S	-	-1.7E-08	-4.3E-04	-2.1E-07
SCQP-S2	Time	0.36	0.36	0.08	0.21
	$\|Ax-b\|$	3.8E-12	1.2E-05	8.5E-14	3.6E-15
	f_*-f_S	-	-9.1E-08	-3.4E-04	-1.2E-06
SCQP-S3	Time	5.92	61.00	71.21	17.48
	$\|Ax-b\|$	7.3E-11	4.9E-10	1.4E-11	8.2E-15
	f_*-f_S	-	-6.9E-07	-4.8E-06	-3.8E-09
SCQP-S4	Time	4.44	60.21	57.45	26.55
	$\|Ax-b\|$	5.6E-11	2.6E-09	2.2E-09	5.8E-15
	f_*-f_S	-	-1.5E-06	-1.7E-07	-7.3E-09
SCQP-S5	Time	21.24	22.37	3.79	4.69
	$\|Ax-b\|$	5.0E-11	1.2E-12	1.0E-11	3.0E-14
	f_*-f_S	-	-5.3E-07	-1.4E-03	-1.5E-07
SCQP-S6	Time	14.60	28.66	4.23	5.51
	$\|Ax-b\|$	9.5E-11	1.9E-10	4.5E-12	1.2E-12
	f_*-f_S	-	1.9E-06	-1.0E-03	-1.3E-05
SCQP-S7	Time	42.52	94.10	39.40	502.41
	$\|Ax-b\|$	8.6E-11	1.9E-06	9.4E-10	1.1E-12
	f_*-f_S	-	-1.4E-06	-1.0E-06	-4.6E-07
SCQP-S8	Time	121.43	24.08	16.24	70.65
	$\|Ax-b\|$	1.7E-11	5.6E-08	7.2E-09	3.3E-13
	f_*-f_S	-	-9.3E-07	-1.2E-04	-4.6E-08
SCQP-S9	Time	147.81	76.31	70.22	1034.30
	$\|Ax-b\|$	6.0E-11	4.9E-07	1.4E-09	5.1E-13
	f_*-f_S	-	-1.3E-04	-1.4E-06	-1.9E-06
SCQP-S10	Time	157.03	52.62	38.92	140.26
	$\|Ax-b\|$	4.6E-10	1.9E-08	2.6E-10	3.5E-13
	f_*-f_S	-	-1.0E-07	-1.0E-08	-1.4E-03
SCQP-S11	Time	159.95	159.25	114.13	628.53
	$\|Ax-b\|$	6.5E-10	1.2E-06	2.3E-07	5.4E-13
	f_*-f_S	-	-6.6E-08	-1.0E-07	-3.5E-05
SCQP-S12	Time	155.29	5093.47	2459.98	3525.44
	$\|Ax-b\|$	1.7E-11	2.1E-06	8.3E-08	4.2E-11
	f_*-f_S	-	-8.3E-05	-1.2E-05	-2.3E-06

Table 4 Experiments on LPs from Netlib test set

Problem	m	n	Results	PG	Cplex Simplex	Gurobi IPM	Matlab IPM	Matlab Simplex
25fv47	622	1571	Time	0.45	0.07	0.07	0.17	12.02
			$\|Ax-b\|$	2.1E-10	8.8E-12	6.2E-12	1.5E-09	3.2E-11
			f_*-f_S	-	9.2E-04	9.2E-04	9.2E-04	9.2E-04
adlittle	57	138	Time	0.19	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.04
			$\|Ax-b\|$	2.8E-10	2.3E-13	1.6E-13	3.3E-11	3.1E-13
			f_*-f_S	-	-1.3E-07	-1.0E-07	-1.0E-07	-1.0E-07
afiro	27	51	Time	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.06
			$\|Ax-b\|$	1.7E-13	1.2E-14	2.0E-14	1.3E-12	1.9E-13
			f_*-f_S	-	0.0E+00	0.0E+00	-1.4E-13	-5.8E-14
agg2	516	758	Time	0.77	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.37
			$\|Ax-b\|$	9.8E-08	1.8E-10	3.3E-10	5.4E-10	2.5E-10
			f_*-f_S	-	6.0E-05	6.0E-05	6.0E-05	-5.5E+06
bandm	302	472	Time	0.19	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.37
			$\|Ax-b\|$	5.3E-10	1.7E-11	5.8E-13	1.0E-10	2.0E-12
			f_*-f_S	-	3.3E-09	3.3E-09	3.3E-09	3.3E-09
beaconfd	173	295	Time	0.18	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.02
			$\|Ax-b\|$	8.2E-10	4.4E-11	1.8E-11	5.5E-11	3.7E-11
			f_*-f_S	-	4.4E-03	4.4E-03	4.4E-03	-3.5E+02
blend	74	114	Time	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.03
			$\|Ax-b\|$	1.6E-09	2.9E-14	3.2E-13	6.2E-12	4.3E-14
			f_*-f_S	-	-1.3E-09	-1.3E-09	-1.4E-09	-1.3E-09
brandy	220	303	Time	0.18	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.21
			$\|Ax-b\|$	1.9E-08	8.6E-13	6.2E-13	7.8E-08	3.7E-12
			f_*-f_S	-	5.5E-07	5.5E-07	5.5E-07	5.5E-07
czprob	929	3562	Time	9.10	0.02	0.02	0.10	0.80
			$\|Ax-b\|$	7.0E-08	2.3E-12	1.1E-12	1.8E-09	1.8E-11
			f_*-f_S	-	5.8E-03	5.8E-03	5.8E-03	-3.6E+05
d6cube	415	6184	Time	0.60	0.28	0.07	0.38	3.40
			$\|Ax-b\|$	8.7E-08	5.3E-11	7.0E-12	1.8E-09	1.4E-11
			f_*-f_S	-	6.4E-09	6.4E-09	2.1E-09	-1.2E+02
degen2	444	754	Time	0.09	0.01	0.02	0.06	2.03
			$\|Ax-b\|$	6.5E-08	3.8E-15	3.9E-15	1.7E-12	3.5E-14
			f_*-f_S	-	-3.8E-07	-3.8E-07	-3.8E-07	-3.8E-07
degen3	1503	2604	Time	0.60	0.10	0.10	1.21	51.94
			$\|Ax-b\|$	1.4E-08	1.6E-14	1.6E-14	6.1E-09	1.2E-13
			f_*-f_S	-	-1.8E-06	-1.8E-06	-1.8E-06	-6.4E-07
dfl001	6071	12230	Time	24.64	2.52	0.85	55.95	59.81
			$\|Ax-b\|$	4.2E-11	1.3E-13	6.2E-07	1.6E-07	8.7E-05
			f_*-f_S	-	6.2E-07	6.2E-07	1.6E-07	8.7E-05
fit1p	627	1677	Time	0.54	0.02	0.02	0.09	8.95
			$\|Ax-b\|$	4.5E-09	7.4E-14	9.0E-14	7.4E-14	2.7E-09
			f_*-f_S	-	3.4E-09	3.4E-09	4.1E-11	3.4E-09
fit2p	3000	13525	Time	0.53	0.01	0.01	0.09	150.68
			$\|Ax-b\|$	2.2E-09	0.0E+00	0.0E+00	3.0E-09	3.1E-11
			f_*-f_S	-	0.0E+00	0.0E+00	-3.6E-13	-7.6E+04
gfrdpnc	616	1160	Time	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01
			$\|Ax-b\|$	1.3E-12	0.0E+00	0.0E+00	1.9E-12	1.9E-12
			f_*-f_S	-	0.0E+00	0.0E+00	-1.4E-16	-1.4E-16
maros-r7	3136	9408	Time	4.91	1.79	0.29	7.99	47.93
			$\|Ax-b\|$	5.6E-09	4.6E-09	4.2E-09	1.9E-10	3.9E-10
			f_*-f_S	-	1.3E-09	0.0E+00	-9.1E-10	-7.1E+05
modszk1	687	1620	Time	0.32	0.01	0.01	0.05	0.88
			$\|Ax-b\|$	7.4E-09	1.7E-10	1.3E-09	1.3E-09	7.6E-11
			f_*-f_S	-	1.8E-03	1.8E-03	1.8E-03	1.8E-03
qap8	912	1632	Time7296	1.90	0.41	0.43	0.68	15.74
			$\|Ax-b\|$	3.5E-12	3.5E-13	1.6E-12	1.4E-10	1.8E-15
			f_*-f_S	-	5.9E-12	3.7E-12	4.7E-10	5.9E-12
qap12	3192	8856	Time	33.06	4.83	0.98	1381.87	1355.30
			$\|Ax-b\|$	8.5E-08	3.8E-12	1.2E-12	7.1E-09	1.3E-15
			f_*-f_S	-	7.7E-05	7.7E-05	7.7E-05	7.7E-05
scfxm1	300	600	Time	0.10	0.00	0.01	0.03	0.43
			$\|Ax-b\|$	3.4E-10	8.0E-12	6.6E-12	2.3E-09	6.4E-12
			f_*-f_S	-	2.7E-08	2.7E-08	2.7E-08	2.7E-08
scfxm2	600	1200	Time	0.27	0.01	0.01	0.05	0.75
			$\|Ax-b\|$	6.0E-09	8.5E-12	8.4E-12	1.6E-08	8.7E-12
			f_*-f_S	-	1.8E-03	1.8E-03	1.8E-03	-3.6E+04

Table 5 Experiments on LPs from Netlib test set

Problem	m	n	Results	PG	Cplex Simplex	Gurobi IPM	Matlab IPM	Matlab Simplex
scfxm3	900	1800	Time	0.38	0.02	0.02	0.07	1.49
			$\|Ax-b\|$	1.8E-08	1.1E-11	1.3E-11	5.9E-08	1.8E-11
			f_*-f_S	-	6.6E-03	6.6E-03	6.5E-03	-4.2E+04
scorpion	388	466	Time	0.22	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.31
			$\|Ax-b\|$	7.7E-10	1.5E-15	8.3E-16	3.6E-13	3.0E-15
			f_*-f_S	-	-6.0E-07	-6.0E-07	-6.6E-07	-6.0E-07
scrs8	490	1275	Time	0.09	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.31
			$\|Ax-b\|$	9.1E-07	2.9E-14	3.0E-14	2.9E-14	3.0E-14
			f_*-f_S	-	6.1E-04	6.1E-04	6.1E-04	6.1E-04
scsd1	77	760	Time	0.07	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.08
			$\|Ax-b\|$	6.5E-10	3.4E-16	1.1E-16	2.8E-13	8.9E-17
			f_*-f_S	-	-9.8E-09	-9.8E-09	-9.5E-09	-9.8E-09
scsd6	147	1350	Time	0.10	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.21
			$\|Ax-b\|$	1.8E-09	2.9E-16	3.6E-16	1.8E-13	3.4E-15
			f_*-f_S	-	-4.7E-08	-4.7E-08	-4.5E-08	-4.1E-08
scsd8	397	2750	Time	0.27	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.81
			$\|Ax-b\|$	1.8E-10	7.0E-15	3.8E-15	3.2E-13	1.7E-14
			f_*-f_S	-	-3.1E-10	-3.1E-10	-2.5E-08	-3.1E-10
sctap1	300	660	Time	0.08	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.36
			$\|Ax-b\|$	6.6E-11	5.0E-15	2.1E-15	5.7E-11	1.2E-13
			f_*-f_S	-	-2.5E-08	-2.5E-08	-2.2E-08	-2.5E-08
sctap2	1090	2500	Time	0.09	0.01	0.01	0.02	4.46
			$\|Ax-b\|$	2.5E-08	1.3E-14	8.5E-16	1.0E-12	4.4E-13
			f_*-f_S	-	-5.5E-08	-5.5E-08	-5.5E-08	-5.5E-08
sctap3	1480	3340	Time	0.88	0.01	0.01	0.07	6.26
			$\|Ax-b\|$	1.0E-08	1.0E-14	6.5E-15	3.3E-12	2.9E-13
			f_*-f_S	-	-7.9E-09	-7.9E-09	-7.1E-09	-7.9E-09
share2b	96	162	Time	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.05
			$\|Ax-b\|$	3.1E-09	9.7E-13	7.2E-13	3.4E-10	2.1E-12
			f_*-f_S	-	-2.0E-07	-2.0E-07	-2.1E-07	-2.0E-07
shell	536	1777	Time	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.11
			$\|Ax-b\|$	2.9E-09	0.0E+00	0.0E+00	5.4E-20	0.0E+00
			f_*-f_S	-	0.0E+00	0.0E+00	-3.9E-15	0.0E+00
ship04l	402	2166	Time	0.21	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.25
			$\|Ax-b\|$	2.2E-10	2.4E-14	3.6E-14	4.7E-11	2.3E-13
			f_*-f_S	-	-7.2E-07	-7.2E-07	-4.0E-05	-7.2E-07
ship04s	402	1506	Time	0.12	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.11
			$\|Ax-b\|$	1.8E-10	2.4E-14	2.9E-14	6.2E-09	6.4E-14
			f_*-f_S	-	-3.8E-06	-3.8E-06	-2.0E-07	-3.8E-06
ship08l	778	4363	Time	1.37	0.01	0.01	0.05	0.49
			$\|Ax-b\|$	1.5E-10	2.2E-14	3.1E-14	2.0E-10	1.1E-13
			f_*-f_S	-	-1.6E-06	-1.6E-06	-2.6E-06	-1.6E-06
ship08s	778	2476	Time	0.58	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.18
			$\|Ax-b\|$	4.8E-11	4.0E-14	1.7E-14	2.4E-11	1.9E-13
			f_*-f_S	-	-2.0E-06	-2.0E-06	-2.5E-06	-2.0E-06
ship12l	1151	5533	Time	3.79	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.17
			$\|Ax-b\|$	1.8E-12	9.9E-14	3.2E-14	3.1E-11	1.6E-13
			f_*-f_S	-	8.7E-08	8.9E-08	4.4E-08	8.4E-08
mship12s	1151	2869	Time	2.90	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.26
			$\|Ax-b\|$	2.3E-12	4.2E-14	6.9E-14	3.1E-11	1.1E-13
			f_*-f_S	-	-1.1E-08	-1.1E-08	-1.8E-05	-1.1E-08
standata	359	1274	Time	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.09
			$\|Ax-b\|$	3.8E-12	0.0E+00	0.0E+00	5.8E-13	0.0E+00
			f_*-f_S	-	0.0E+00	0.0E+00	-1.9E-13	0.0E+00
standgub	361	1383	Time	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.07
			$\|Ax-b\|$	3.3E-11	0.0E+00	0.0E+00	1.6E-12	2.5E-13
			f_*-f_S	-	0.0E+00	0.0E+00	-1.0E-11	0.0E+00
standmps	467	1274	Time	0.24	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.44
			$\|Ax-b\|$	5.5E-08	6.8E-14	2.5E-13	4.2E-12	1.5E-12
			f_*-f_S	-	7.1E-08	7.1E-08	7.1E-08	-5.9E+02
stocfor2	2157	3042	Time	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.02
			$\|Ax-b\|$	3.0E-08	1.4E-12	1.9E-12	1.5E-10	4.8E-12
			f_*-f_S	-	8.7E-06	8.7E-06	8.7E-06	8.7E-06
truss	1000	8806	Time	6.63	0.09	2.07	0.15	18.60
			$\|Ax-b\|$	9.3E-08	1.5E-13	1.3E-13	1.9E-11	9.0E-12
			f_*-f_S	-	9.5E-03	9.5E-03	9.5E-03	9.5E-03

Table 6 Experiments on SCQPs from CUTEr test set

Problem	m	n	Results	ALM/APG-PAS	Cplex(IPM)	Gurobi(simplex)	Matlab(IPM)
aug2dcqp	10000	20200	Time	0.54	0.13	0.25	2.07
			$\|Ax-b\|$	8.9E-11	2.2E-07	3.9E-13	4.0E-13
			$f_* - f_S$	-	1.7E-03	-1,4E-04	-1.4E-05
aug2dqp	10000	20200	Time	0.65	0.13	0.27	2.17
			$\|Ax-b\|$	7.7E-11	1.7E-07	3.9E-13	3.9E-13
			$f_* - f_S$	-	1.2E-03	-1.1E-05	-1.1E-05
aug3dcqp	1000	3873	Time	0.13	0.03	0.05	0.20
			$\|Ax-b\|$	7.2E-10	3.5E-10	1.2E-14	1.1E-14
			$f_* - f_S$	-	-1.9E-07	-1.2E-07	-7.0E-08
aug3dqp	1000	3873	Time	0.09	0.02	0.05	0.20
			$\|Ax-b\|$	2.5E-10	5.1E-10	1.2E-14	1.2E-14
			$f_* - f_S$	-	-3.8E-08	-3.0E-08	-4.9E-08
cont-050	2401	3597	Time	0.50	0.18	0.09	0.27
			$\|Ax-b\|$	2.2E-10	5.1E-10	1.2E-14	1.2E-14
			$f_* - f_S$	-	-9.0E-10	-4.1E-10	-1.5E-06
cont-100	9801	10197	Time	0.51	0.39	0.53	2.06
			$\|Ax-b\|$	4.7E-11	2.3E-14	2.3E-14	2.2E-14
			$f_* - f_S$	-	-1.6E-09	-1.5E-09	-2.6E-06
cont-101	10098	10197	Time	3.92	0.43	0.43	1.87
			$\|Ax-b\|$	9.2E-10	8.8E-13	7.0E-14	1.5E-13
			$f_* - f_S$	-	-6.3E-07	-6.1E-07	-6.1E-07
cvxqp1_l	5000	10000	Time	23.32	13.83	12.67	50.84
			$\|Ax-b\|$	8.3E-10	1.5E-06	5.5E-07	2.9E-14
			$f_* - f_S$	-	-1.5E-01	-3.2E-01	-2.5E-02
cvxqp1_m	500	1000	Time	0.15	0.23	0.31	0.57
			$\|Ax-b\|$	3.1E-10	2.4E-07	4.1E-09	9.0E-15
			$f_* - f_S$	-	-4.4E-03	-9.2E-05	-5.6E-05
cvxqp1_s	50	100	Time	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02
			$\|Ax-b\|$	6.7E-10	2.0E-12	6.3E-10	2.5E-15
			$f_* - f_S$	-	-1.4E-05	-9.8E-07	-8.9E-07
cvxqp2_l	2500	10000	Time	1.19	7.14	2.06	18.49
			$\|Ax-b\|$	2.4E-10	6.6E-10	2.5E-07	2.3E-14
			$f_* - f_S$	-	-6.5E-02	-1.4E-03	-1.2E-04
cvxqp2_m	250	1000	Time	0.08	0.19	0.29	0.31
			$\|Ax-b\|$	3.3E-10	9.8E-10	5.6E-10	6.8E-15
			$f_* - f_S$	-	-3.0E-03	-1.9E-06	-4.3E-06
cvxqp2_s	25	100	Time	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01
			$\|Ax-b\|$	5.8E-11	5.5E-10	5.1E-12	1.5E-15
			$f_* - f_S$	-	-7.9E-06	-3.0E-06	-4.9E-06
cvxqp3_l	7500	10000	Time	42.52	19.45	77.71	72.05
			$\|Ax-b\|$	4.4E-07	1.3E-05	4.0E-06	3.3E-14
			$f_* - f_S$	-	-6.6E-04	-3.6E-04	-5.1E-07
cvxqp3_m	750	1000	Time	0.38	0.33	0.22	0.77
			$\|Ax-b\|$	27E-10	5.2E-09	4.3E-10	1.0E-14
			$f_* - f_S$	-	-6.5E-03	4.0E-05	-1.9E-04
cvxqp3_s	75	100	Time	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
			$\|Ax-b\|$	2.9E-11	3.9E-12	1.1E-10	3.4E-15
			$f_* - f_S$	-	-1.8E-05	-4.6E-08	-4.5E-08
dual1	1	85	Time	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
			$\|Ax-b\|$	8.8E-16	9.9E-14	1.1E-10	3.4E-15
			$f_* - f_S$	-	-1.0E-09	-1.5E-09	-2.0E-09
dual2	1	96	Time	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01
			$\|Ax-b\|$	1.1E-16	1.3E-14	1.7E-12	3.3E-16
			$f_* - f_S$	-	3.7E-11	-4.1E-13	-8.2E-12
dual3	1	111	Time	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02
			$\|Ax-b\|$	7.7E-16	5.4E-13	9.5E-12	5.6E-16
			$f_* - f_S$	-	-5.6E-11	-9.3E-10	-1.1E-09
dual4	1	75	Time	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
			$\|Ax-b\|$	1.1E-15	5.5E-13	2.E-12	0.00E+00
			$f_* - f_S$	-	-1.4E-10	-5.4E-11	-8.5E-12
gouldqp2	349	699	Time	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.02
			$\|Ax-b\|$	0.00E+00	1.2E-17	3.8E-17	1.4E-17
			$f_* - f_S$	-	-9.9E-10	-1.1E-10	-5.8E-06
gouldqp3	349	699	Time	0.09	0.02	0.02	0.04
			$\|Ax-b\|$	4.7E-13	2.5E-11	4.4E-10	1.4E-14
			$f_* - f_S$	-	-4.2E-07	1.5E-11	7.3E-12

Table 7 Experiments on QPs from CUTEr test set

Problem	m	n	Results	ALM/APG-PAS	Cplex(IPM)	Gurobi(simplex)	Matlab(IPM)
hs35	1	3	Time	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01
			$\|Ax-b\|$	0.0E+00	4.4E-16	4.4E-16	4.4E-16
			$f_* - f_S$	-	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	1.8E-15
hs35mod	1	3	Time	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01
			$\|Ax-b\|$	0.0E+00	0.0E+00	0.0E+00	0.0E+00
			$f_* - f_S$	-	0.0E+00	0.0E+00	0.0E+00
hs53	1	3	Time	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
			$\|Ax-b\|$	0.0E+00	0.0E+00	0.0E+00	0.0E+00
			$f_* - f_S$	-	0.0E+00	0.0E+00	0.0E+00
lotschd	7	12	Time	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01
			$\|Ax-b\|$	1.4E-10	3.8E-14	2.2E-14	3.5E-14
			$f_* - f_S$	-	-3.6E-06	-7.6E-09	-5.5E-09
mosarqp1	700	2500	Time	0.16	0.04	0.03	0.19
			$\|Ax-b\|$	7.0E-11	8.9E-10	1.0E-11	1.8E-13
			$f_* - f_S$	-	-1.8E-05	9.9E-06	9.9E-06
mosarqp2	600	900	Time	0.15	0.03	0.02	0.10
			$\|Ax-b\|$	1.7E-11	4.7E-11	1.8E-10	4.4E-13
			$f_* - f_S$	-	-3.7E-03	1.1E-04	-1.1E-04
powell20	10000	10000	Time	0.09	0.17	0.12	1.00
			$\|Ax-b\|$	3.9E-09	4.8E-07	2.2E-11	7.2E-11
			$f_* - f_S$	-	-2.8E+00	-6.7E+00	-6.7E+00
qgrow7	140	301	Time	0.06	0.03	0.02	0.12
			$\|Ax-b\|$	1.2E-09	3.0E-10	2.1E-12	17E-12
			$f_* - f_S$	-	-3.4E-04	-1.2E-08	-1.0E-08
qgrow15	300	645	Time	0.09	0.04	0.03	0.19
			$\|Ax-b\|$	1.1E-10	1.1E-09	2.7E-12	3.3E-12
			$f_* - f_S$	-	-5.4E-05	-5.2E-09	-3.2E-08
qgrow22	440	946	Time	0.27	0.27	0.12	0.99
			$\|Ax-b\|$	5.2E-11	4.8E-07	2.2E-11	7.2E-11
			$f_* - f_S$	-	-9.3E+00	-9.3E+00	-9.3E+00
qscsd1	77	760	Time	0.15	0.02	0.02	0.10
			$\|Ax-b\|$	4.4E-10	3.9E-11	4.2E-16	3.3E-16
			$f_* - f_S$	-	-1.0E-08	-3.2E-09	-2.2E-07
qscsd6	147	1350	Time	0.24	0.02	0.03	0.08
			$\|Ax-b\|$	3.4E-09	2.3E-12	9.7E-15	1.3E-15
			$f_* - f_S$	-	-3.9E-08	-2.2E-07	-5.8E-07
qscsd8	397	2750	Time	0.83	0.04	0.04	0.26
			$\|Ax-b\|$	8.9E-09	9.9E-11	1.2E-13	1.7E-14
			$f_* - f_S$	-	-1.8E-07	-6.5E-07	-1.9E-07
stcqp1	2052	4097	Time	0.05	0.04	0.02	0.09
			$\|Ax-b\|$	4.0E-09	4.0E-13	4.0E-13	3.6E-14
			$f_* - f_S$	-	-5.8E-04	-2.3E-05	-1.1E-04
stcqp2	2052	4097	Time	0.05	0.51	0.01	0.11
			$\|Ax-b\|$	0.0E+00	0.0E+00	0.0E+00	0.0E+00
			$f_* - f_S$	-	-2.6E-04	-1.1E-06	-6.9E-05
tame	1	2	Time	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
			$\|Ax-b\|$	5.5E-10	0.0E+00	1.1E-16	0.0E+00
			$f_* - f_S$	-	-2.8E-13	-2.8E-13	-2.8E-13
values	1	202	Time	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02
			$\|Ax-b\|$	5.5E-16	1.1E-13	9.7E-12	1.8E-16
			$f_* - f_S$	-	-2.7E-09	-3.5E-10	-4.0E-07

We use "PAS-Sort" to denote the improved PAS algorithm which uses sorting technique. The results show that our sorting technique is useful.

6 Conclusion

Projected gradient method converges in finite times when it is applied to linear programming. Moreover, the SCQPs generated by PG iterations are relative, which implies the solution of the front one is a good approximation to the back one.

Table 8 PAS method in qpOASES and the improved PAS method solving the first augmented lagrangian problem from $\hat{z}$ like (22)

Problem	n	PAS-Sort		PAS(qpOASES)	
		Iter	Time	Iter	Time
aug2dcqp	20200	9	0.14	9	208.76
aug2dqp	20200	9	0.13	10	223.33
aug3dcqp	3873	2	0.02	2	14.12
aug3dqp	3873	2	0.02	2	12.48
cont-50	3597	30	0.22	31	9.61
cont-100	10197	4	0.04	4	275.04
cont-101	10197	60	1.79	61	156.44
cvxqp1_l	10000	82	6.72	99	542.67
cvxqp2_l	10000	4	0.15	4	53.88
cvxqp3_l	10000	29	3.94	36	245.93
mosarqp1	2500	18	0.04	25	3.99
mosarqp2	900	6	0.03	6	0.36
powell20	10000	2	0.02	3	0.10
qgrow22	946	14	0.08	14	0.16
qscsd6	1350	50	0.05	61	0.45
qscsd8	2740	61	0.17	73	2.62
stcqp1	4097	2	0.01	2	0.26
stcqp2	4097	1	0.01	1	5.59

For SCQP, ALM has superlinear convergence rate when the subproblems are solved exactly. Thus our exactly solving the subproblems by APG-PAS algorithm ensures this property.

APG algorithm converges slowly at end of the iterations, which hinders it to be independent algorithm for (24). The performance of PAS highly depends on the prediction of the optimal active-set. Then the approximately solving of APG is indispensable. With the approximately solving stage, the steps of PAS method in the second stage would greatly reduce. For these reasons, the two-stage algorithm is meaningful. Moreover, our sorting technique indeed reduces the computations for cholesky decomposition, which helps the two-stage algorithm performs better.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank the colleagues for their valuable suggestions that led to improvement in this paper. This research was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (11571061, 11401075), and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (DUT16LK05)

References

1. Ilog cplex: High performance software of mathematical programming. http://www.ilog.com/products/cplex
2. Andersen, E.D., Ye, Y.: A computational study of the homogeneous algorithm for large-scale convex optimization. Computational Optimization and Applications **10**(3), 243–269 (1998)
3. Bertsekas, D.P.: On the goldstein-levitin-polyak gradient projection method. IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control **21**(2), 174–184 (1976)
4. Bertsekas, D.P.: Projected newton methods for optimization problems with simple constraints. SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization **20**(2), 221–246 (1982)
5. Bertsekas, D.P.: Constrained optimization and Lagrange multiplier methods. Academic Press (2014)

6. Best, M.J.: An algorithm for the solution of the parametric quadratic programming problem. Springer (1996)
7. Bixby, R.E.: Solving real-world linear programs: A decade and more of progress. Operations Research **50**(1), 3–15 (2002)
8. Burke, J.V., Moré, J.J.: Exposing constraints. SIAM Journal on Optimization **4**(3), 573–595 (1994)
9. Conn, A.R., Gould, N.I., Toint, P.: A globally convergent augmented lagrangian algorithm for optimization with general constraints and simple bounds. SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis **28**(2), 545–572 (1991)
10. Conn, A.R., Gould, N.I., Toint, P.L.: Testing a class of methods for solving minimization problems with simple bounds on the variables. Mathematical Computation **50**(182), 399–430 (1988)
11. Dantzig, G.B.: Linear programming and extensions. Princeton University Press (1998)
12. Dantzig, G.B., Orden, A., Wolfe, P., Kantorovich, L.: The generalized simplex method for minimizing a linear form under linear inequality restraints. Pacific Journal of Mathematics **5**(2), 183–195 (1955)
13. Dostál, Z., Friedlander, A., Santos, S.A.: Augmented lagrangians with adaptive precision control for quadratic programming with simple bounds and equality constraints. SIAM Journal on Optimization **13**(4), 1120–1140 (2003)
14. Dostál, Z., Schoberl, J.: Minimizing quadratic functions subject to bound constraints with the rate of convergence and finite termination. Computation Optimization and Applications **30**(1), 23–43 (2005)
15. Ferreau, H.J., Kirches, C., Potschka, A., Bock, H.G., Diehl, M.: qpoases: A parametric active-set algorithm for quadratic programming. Mathematical Programming Compution **6**(4), 327–363 (2014)
16. Fletcher, R.: A general quadratic programming algorithm. IMA Journal Numerical Analysis **7**(1), 76–91 (1971)
17. Fletcher, R.: Stable reduced hessian updates for indefinite quadratic programming. Mathematical Programming **87**(2), 251–264 (2000)
18. Forrest, J.J., Goldfarb, D.: Steepest-edge simplex algorithms for linear programming. Mathematical Programming **57**(1-3), 341–374 (1992)
19. Freund, R.M.: A potential-function reduction algorithm for solving a linear program directly from an infeasible warm start. Mathematical Programming **52**(1-3), 441–466 (1991)
20. Friedlander, A., Martínez, J.M.: On the maximization of a concave quadratic function with box constraints. SIAM Journal on Optimization **4**(1), 177–192 (1994)
21. Friedlander, M.P., Leyffer, S.: Global and finite termination of a two-phase augmented lagrangian filter method for general quadratic programs. SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing **30**(4), 1706–1729 (2008)
22. Goldfarb, D., Reid, J.K.: A practicable steepest-edge simplex algorithm. Mathematical Programming **12**(1), 361–371 (1977)
23. Gould, N.I.: An algorithm for large-scale quadratic programming. IMA Journal on Numerical Analysis **11**(3), 299–324 (1991)
24. Hager, W.W.: The dual active set algorithm and its application to linear programming. Computational Optimization and Applications **21**(3), 263–275 (2002)
25. Harris, P.M.: Pivot selection methods of the devex lp code. Mathematical programming **5**(1), 1–28 (1973)
26. Hestenes, M.R.: Multiplier and gradient methods. Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications **4**(5), 303–320 (1969)
27. Karmarkar, N.: A new polynomial-time algorithm for linear programming. In: Proceedings of the sixteenth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing, pp. 302–311. ACM (1984)
28. Kheirfam, B.: Simplified infeasible interior-point algorithm for sdo using full nesterov-todd step. Numerical Algorithms **59**(4), 589–606 (2012)
29. Kim, D., Sra, S., Dhillon, I.S.: Tackling box-constrained optimization via a new projected quasi-newton approach. SIAM J. Sci. Comput. **32**(6), 3548–3563 (2010)
30. Kojima, M., Megiddo., N., Mizuno, S.: A primaldual infeasible-interior-point algorithm for linear programming. Mathematical programming **61**(1-3), 263–280 (1993)

31. Lemke, C.E.: The dual method of solving the linear programming problem. Naval Res. Logist. Quart. **1**(1), 36–47 (1954)
32. Lin, Y., Pang, J.S.: Iterative methods for large convex quadratic programs: A survey. SIAM J. Control Optim. **25**(2), 383–411 (1987)
33. Liu, Z., Sun, W.: An infeasible interior-point algorithm with full-newton step for linear optimization. Numerical Algorithms **46**(2), 173–188 (2007)
34. Lustig, I.J.: Feasibility issues in a primal-dual interior-point method for linear programming. Mathematical Programming **49**(1-3), 145–162 (1990)
35. Mangasarian, O.L.: Iterative solution of linear programs. SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis **18**(4), 606–614 (1981)
36. Mangasarian, O.L., Meyer, R.R.: Nonlinear perturbation of linear programs. SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization **17**(6), 745–752 (1979)
37. Mehrotra, S.: On the implementation of a primal-dual interior point method. SIAM Journal on Optimization **2**(4), 575–601 (1992)
38. Monteiro, R.D., Adler, I.: Interior path following primal-dual algorithms. part i: Linear programming. Mathematical programming **44**(1-3), 27–41 (1989)
39. Moré, J.J., Toraldo, G.: Algorithms for bound constrained quadratic programming problems. Numerische Mathematik **55**(4), 377–400 (1989)
40. Moré, J.J., Toraldo, G.: On the solution of large quadratic programming problems with bound constraints. SIAM Journal on Optimization **1**(1), 93–113 (1991)
41. Nesterov, Y.: Smooth minimization of non-smooth functions. Mathematical programming **103**(1), 127–152 (2005)
42. Nesterov, Y., et al.: Gradient methods for minimizing composite objective function (2007)
43. O'Leary, D.P.: A generalized conjugate gradient algorithm for solving a class of quadratic programming problems. Linear Algebra and its Applications **34**, 371–399 (1980)
44. Pan, P.Q.: Efficient nested pricing in the simplex algorithm. Operations Research Letters **36**(3), 309–313 (2008)
45. Pan, P.Q.: A largest-distance pivot rule for the simplex algorithm. European journal of operational research **187**(2), 393–402 (2008)
46. de Panne, C.V., Whinston, A.: The simplex and the dual method for quadratic programming. OR pp. 355–388 (1964)
47. Potra, F.A.: An infeasible-interior-point predictor-corrector algorithm for linear programming. SIAM Journal on Optimization **6**(1), 19–32 (1996)
48. Powell, M.J.D.: A method for nonlinear constraints in minimization problems. In Optimization pp. 283–298 (1969)
49. Ritter, K.: On parametric linear and quadratic programming problems. Tech. rep., DTIC Document (1981)
50. Robert, R.V.: Linear programming: Foundations and extensions (1996)
51. Roos, C.: An improved and simplified full-newton step o(n) infeasible interior-point method for linear optimization. SIAM Journal on Optimization **25**(1), 102–114 (2015)
52. Tanabe, K.: Centered newton method for linear programming: Interior and exterior point method (in janpanese). In: New Methods for Linear Programming (Ed. 3), 98–100 (1990)
53. Wolfe, P.: The simplex method for quadratic programming. Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society pp. 382–398 (1959)
54. Wright, S.J.: Implementing proximal point methods for linear programming. Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications **65**(3), 531–554 (1990)
55. Wright, S.J.: Primal-dual interior-point methods. Siam (1997)
56. Wu, F., Wu, S., Ye, Y.: On quadratic convergence of the o($\sqrt{nL}$)-iteration homogeneous and self-duallinear programming algorithm. Annals of Operations Research **87**, 393–406 (1999)
57. Yang, E.K., Tolle, J.W.: A class of methods for solving large, convex quadratic programs subject to box constraints. Mathematical Programming **51**(1-3), 223–228 (1991)
58. Ye, Y., Todd, M.J., Mizuno, S.: An o($\sqrt{nL}$)-iteration homogeneous and self-dual linear programming algorithm. Mathematics of Operations Research **19**(1), 53–67 (1994)
59. Zhang, Y.: Solving large-scale linear programs by interior-point methods under the matlab environment. Optimization Methods and Software **10**(1), 1–31 (1998)